Ninth Circuit affirmed this court on both of petitioner's arguments on direct appeal. First, the appellate court found that this court did not err when it declined to grant petitioner a downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility because petitioner had not carried his burden of clearly demonstrating acceptance of responsibility. (Doc. #163). Second, the appellate court held that this

28

25

26

27

1	court did not err when it gave petitioner an upward adjustment for reckless endangerment because
2	petitioner did not object to the presentence report's recommendation at sentencing. (Doc. #163).
3	In the present motion to vacate under § 2255, petitioner asserts three grounds for relief, all
4	of which include an allegation of ineffective assistance of counsel. (Doc. #181).
5	Petitioner filed the instant § 2255 motion through attorney David Arredondo. However, Mr.
6	Arredondo is not attorney of record in this case. Accordingly, the clerk's office issued a notice of
7	attorney action required, stating that Mr. Arredondo must file a verified petition if he wishes to file
8	in this case. (Doc. #183). To date, Mr. Arredondo has not filed a verified petition.
9	Good cause appearing,
10	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the United States file an
11	opposition or otherwise respond to petitioner's § 2255 motion by June 29, 2012. Petitioner shall file
12	a reply by July 29, 2012.
13	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, on or before June 15, 2012, David Arredondo show cause
14	why the motion to vacate sentence should not be denied for failure to file a verified petition.
15	DATED June 4, 2012.
16	
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Case 2:08-cr-00347-JCM-PAL Document 184 Filed 06/04/12 Page 2 of 2

28